ADDRESSES

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE LAWYERS CLUB

NEW YORK

ON THE SUBJECT OF

THE CENTENNIAL OF THE RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT OF 1817

By

SIR EDMUND WALKER

and

SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK

SATURDAY, MARCH 17th, 1917

The Lawyers Club

One Hundred and Fifteen Broadway

New York City

William Allen Butler, *President*

Alton B. Parker, *Vice-President* Robert C. Morris, *Vice-President*

R. G. Babbage, *Secretary*

B. M. Fellows, *Treasurer*

Edwin J. Beinecke, *Chairman House Committee*

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

H. S. Black
R. G. Babbage
Wm. Allen Butler
Edgar M. Cullen
Wm. C. Demorest
John Hays Hammond
Ernest Hall
Job E. Hedges
Charles Evans Hughes
George L. Ingraham
Robert C. Morris
Perley Morse
Ormsby McHarg
George McAneny
Morgan J. O'Brien
Alton B. Parker
John B. Stanchfield
John A. Stewart

COMMITTEE ON MEETINGS AND SPEAKERS

Ormsby McHarg,
Chairman

Perley Morse,
Secretary

William Allen Butler,
President of the Club (ex officio)
Dean Emery
William Forster
Alfred W. Kiddle
W. A. Mitchell
Robert C. Morris
Chester DeWitt Pugsley
A. H. Spencer
John A. Stewart
Walter B. Walker
Henry A. Wise
Eugene C. Worden

CENTENNIAL OF THE
Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817

MEETING OF

THE LAWYERS CLUB

Saturday, March 17th, 1917

12:45 P. M.

A. H. SPENCER, Esq., Presiding.

WILLIAM ALLEN BUTLER, Esq., President of The Lawyers Club:

MEMBERS OF THE LAWYERS CLUB, SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK, SIR EDMUND WALKER, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

We are always encouraged to see the ladies interested in the serious questions that are appealing to the lawyers and other citizens to-day. A year ago this club, actuated by a strong patriotic impulse, invited The Right Honorable Sir Robert Laird Borden, Premier of Canada, to become one of our honorary members. We were desirous of expressing our admiration of the loyalty and splendid devotion of Canada to the mother country. When Sir Robert, speaking of the effect of the war upon Canada and referring to his compatriots, said:

> "Involved in the most terrible struggle that humanity has ever known—a struggle in which we have taken part of our own free will and because we recognize the world-compelling consideration which its issues involve—the events of the past two years have brought both a lesson and an inspiration."

Since Sir Robert spoke those words four months have passed. The Canadians are surpassing all previous records, fighting with magnificent enthusiasm for those everlasting principles of Justice, Liberty and Humanity, as vital to us as they are to them.

Recent events have caused some of us to ask the question: Should Canada and the Allies lose, where do we stand? Our interests are identical. At last, thank God, we are thoroughly alive to the fact that life would not be worth living in Canada or in this country under German ideals.

Honored guests from Canada, in order that you may all know where we stand here in New York and that we are all waking up to the conditions that confront us, I will read to you a declaration that is being signed to-day by the members of this Club and by thousands and thousands of our fellow citizens. It is addressed to the President of the United States.

> "As an American, faithful to American ideals of justice, liberty and humanity, and confident that the Government has exerted its most earnest efforts to keep us at peace with the world, I hereby declare my absolute and unconditional loyalty to the Government of the United States and pledge my support to you in protecting American rights against unlawful violence upon land and sea, in guarding the nation against hostile attacks and in upholding international right."

Nearly a million of the citizens of the United States have already signed this petition and I am informed by his Honor the Mayor that within a week it will be signed by two per cent of our total population.

The text of this meeting is the Rush-Bagot Agreement, of just exactly one hundred years ago. Canada and the United States have lived for a century in peace. It is the greatest illustration in history that such a relationship can exist. It would seem, therefore, to follow that the United States and Canada, standing together in the defense of ideals common to both countries, could overcome any nation on the eastern continent.

The Right Honorable Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court at Ottawa, is highly esteemed in his own country as a learned and fearless judge. In Washington his decisions command respect, as they do also in the courts of our own state. He is a welcome and honored guest whenever he crosses the border. I am sure that he follows our affairs with great interest.

Sir Edmund Walker, from his long residence in New York as agent of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, is well known to many here present. Sir Edmund has the title of Commander of the Victorian Order, and LL. D. of a Canadian University; a great contributor to financial literature and is recognized in Canada as one of the leaders in finance.

These gentlemen have honored us by accepting life membership in The Lawyers Club, unanimously extended to them by the Governors as a mark of appreciation of the distinguished services which they have rendered to Canada.

It is the prerogative of Mr. A. H. Spencer, who is chairman of this meeting, to introduce the speakers, and I will, therefore, yield the platform to him.

A. H. SPENCER, Esq.:

The Lawyers Club today is host to a goodly company. I need not refer to those who are to address you and whose names have already been announced, further than has been done by Mr. Butler. We have with us, in addition, some whose names have not yet been announced and, as you should know your guests, I will herewith name them.

We have, in addition to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick and Sir Edmund Walker, the Honorable C. J. Doherty, who is the Minister of Justice of Canada, and Sir Lomer Gouin, who is the Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec, also Dr. C. W. Colby, Professor of History in McGill University.

And, let me add, we have also with us the Consuls General from Japan, Italy, France, Russia, England and Belgium. I withhold Belgium until the last for the obvious reason that it may be the last note in this symphony.

As it is usual to withhold the sweetmeats until the end of the feast, let me also say that we have with us Lady Fitzpatrick and Lady Gouin. You are now all acquainted.

Now, gentlemen of The Lawyers Club and guests, it is proper on this occasion that the Chief Magistrate of the city should extend our welcome and his to our Canadian friends. I have the pleasure of introducing His Honor the Mayor of the City of New York, the Honorable John Purroy Mitchel.

THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK:

MR. CHAIRMAN, SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK, SIR EDMUND WALKER, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

It is my very grateful duty to extend the cordial welcome of the City of New York to our distinguished guests of honor and to our other many guests and friends from Canada, and to say to them that New York is most happy to have them here within its confines and to be able to extend to them the assurance of the cordial feeling of fellowship that exists between the people of this city and the people of this whole country toward the people of Canada. There are a great many evil results, Mr. Chairman, that may possibly flow from the threatened railroad strike that is likely to be declared to-night; but we may look upon it with less apprehension from the fact that it may possibly keep our guests with us a little longer.

In addition to this tribute of esteem to the two guests of honor and to the other guests, this meeting, as I understand it, is called also to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the treaty between the United States and Canada that provides against fortifications upon our national boundaries and against the maintenance of a navy upon the Great Lakes. That was because the people of Canada and the people of the United States recognized a hundred years ago that there was a sympathy of ideals, a community of purpose, a likeness in the character of government and in the aims and the objects of the two people sufficient to make it not only improbable but practically impossible that these two countries would ever have need to defend themselves against each other. It seems to me that that lies in the fundamental fact that they are both essentially democracies, that they have these common ideals of democracy and that there is no likelihood that in democracies such as these there will ever develop a spirit of aggression against a neighbor that would ever raise a necessity for the protection of the one against the other in the future. We, too, have reason to-day, as we have had through many a month past, to congratulate Canada upon what she has achieved during these two years and a half. We have seen Canada gradually assembling her resources, gradually organizing the power of the country and marshaling it for the defense of the interests of the country and for the maintenance of her ideals. We have seen Canada, in short, preparing herself for war; and, though we have seen her preparing herself, there has been nothing in the slightest degree in that in the way of a threat against the peace or the interests of the United States; but only has there been occasion to congratulate Canada upon the success with which she has met this issue that was thrust upon her and the completeness with which she has been able to organize and to prepare and to train her people to carry their

share of the great burden; and to-day Canada sees the United States about to undertake, in all human probability, the same kind of a task—the task of gathering her national resources together and organizing them and preparing them to meet a similar issue; and Canada in that fact finds no suggestion of a threat against the peace or the security of Canada, again for the reason that the purposes, aims and ideals of the two countries are alike.

We have a great deal to learn of the lesson of self-sacrifice, a great deal to learn of the possibilities of the developing of a spiritual unity in the country that makes for peace, from the great tasks that Canada has performed and must yet perform. We have a great deal yet to learn, too, from the problems that she faced and the difficulties she met, of what a people in preparing for war must expect to have to do before they can become prepared for war; and there is no lesson that should sink more deeply into the conscience of the American people than this lesson —that a nation which is untrained, without munitions, without equipment and without men prepared, is not ready for an issue such as this that has confronted Canada and may shortly confront the people of the United States.

We heard only yesterday from the Ambassador who has so efficiently represented this nation at the capital of the German Empire that in his opinion the only thing that will prepare the United States to meet the issue that he sees coming is to be willing to sacrifice—for the people to be willing to sacrifice—their convenience, their leisure and their comfort enough to impose upon themselves the system of universal military training and service. Well, some of us have been preaching that for two years, but it takes time in a democracy for facts to sink into the public conscience.

Mr. Chairman, that is one of the great difficulties with a democracy, the fact that it takes a long time for public opinion to come to the support of progressive and constructive measures. The people must learn the facts, and that takes time. Then they must assimilate them and they must be able to interpret them accurately. The people of the United States have come to understand that the people of this country are unprepared for war; that they are without munitions, without equipment, without even industry organized to meet the exigencies of war. Now they are coming to interpret those facts and the lessons and experiences of Europe, and to understand that they must adopt this measure—the only one that is suited to life in a democracy—which lays the obligations of military service to the country on every man of the republic alike, on rich and poor and high and low, and asks no man to go out and render to his country a service that another man can shirk. And I was struck, too, by the other statement

of Ambassador Gerard that after two years of absence he was shocked to come back to this country and to find that practically nothing as yet had been actually accomplished toward preparing the United States for war. We have had appropriation bills and we have had plans formulated, but in its fundamentals, that statement of Ambassador Gerard is true, that this country at this moment is almost as unprepared for war as it was on the first of August, 1914, when this great European conflict broke out.

It is for us, sir, inspired, if you will, by the example of the men and the women of Canada, to prepare ourselves now and to demonstrate to the world that the people of a democracy are not so wholly self-centered in individual wealth, in the individual pursuit of happiness, that they are not willing to make that little sacrifice that entails a brief period of service of the youth of the country, at a time when the economic burden will not be heavy, and so to set up that national insurance against disaster that in private business would be considered but a very low premium to pay for the result.

And this is what we must do, we of the United States, if we would carry the obligation that is laid upon us in our trusteeship of these great principles and institutions of democracy which we, sir, inherited here, because that duty rests upon us more than any other people in this day and at this time. If we would discharge that duty and carry that obligation we must be prepared to make that demonstration to the world and, sir, I submit that in our doing so, and in Canada's doing so, which has already been accomplished, as I said before there is no conceivable threat involved against the peace or the interests of the other country.

Canada and the United States both preparing to defend their ideals, their national and their international ideals against attack, will never constitute a threat against each other, because both countries are inspired by the same ideals, actuated by the same motives, and have the same ultimate purposes in view.

A. H. SPENCER, Esq.:

Among those whom we had invited to attend this meeting was, very naturally, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. We realized that it was doubtful whether he could leave his affairs at this juncture, when there are very many important questions confronting the Supreme Court; and, therefore, regretting that he is not here, I will read the letter which has been received from Chief Justice White:

"Your kind letter of March 8th has remained unreplied to because of the particular pressure on my time at the moment of its receipt.

"You are very kind to ask me to be present at a luncheon at The Lawyers Club in the City of New York on March 17th next, when the Club is to have the privilege and pleasure of hearing Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, and requesting if I can not myself come that I might assign one of my brethren to that agreeable duty.

"So far as the first request is concerned, I am very reluctantly obliged to say that my public duties absolutely exclude the possibility of my coming to New York on the day stated. As to the second, I am wholly without authority over my brethren to do as you are good enough to ask me to do. Moreover, even if this latter were not the case, as I know that their duties are equally as onerous as mine, I should dislike much to, indeed could not, set the example of asking them to be absent.

"Trusting that the meeting may be as agreeable as I am sure it will prove to be, and thanking the Club for its invitation and yourself for the kind manner in which you have conveyed it, I am,

"Very truly yours,
"E. D. WHITE."

The conduct of the financial affairs of this country is not confined entirely to those whose names are immediately familiar to you in this particular circle. Among those institutions which are world-wide in their influence is The Canadian Bank of Commerce, and among those who are well known in banking circles and in similar environment all over the world is our next speaker.

Now, in connection with Sir Edmund Walker, I have in my notes a page of single spaced type in which are mentioned the several and various positions of honor and trust which Sir Edmund has occupied. As this is only a lawyers' club and not a society of statistical engineers, I will omit the majority of these references and merely mention a few, as my eye happens to catch them in going down the list.

The first is that Sir Edmund entered the office of his uncle, a private banker, in 1861, when he was less than thirteen years old. You see he has been handling dollars for some time. I don't know whether he commenced earlier than that with the cents, but I suspect it.

I see that he also lays some emphasis upon the fact—or, rather, emphasis is laid upon the fact—that he became Honorary

President of the Mendelssohn Choir at the time of its foundation in 1900, and is still in office—"the leading choir in America"—it is called in parentheses. May I not mention in passing that we have a Mendelssohn Glee Club here, which is some choir too; Chairman of the Commission on Money and Credit of the St. Louis Exposition; Commander of the Victorian Order, 1908; Knight Bachelor, 1910; and Knight of Grace, Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem, in England, 1910. And, as I go along, I find mentioned: Fellow of the Geological Society of England; Institute of Bankers of England; Royal Economic Society of England; Royal Colonial Institute of England, and Royal Society of Canada, etc., etc., etc.

I have great pleasure in introducing Sir Edmund Walker.

ADDRESS OF SIR EDMUND WALKER

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Lawyers Club has conferred on me, or is about to do so, one of the greatest honors that has come to me in my life and I am deeply moved, I can assure you, by the spirit of kindliness which has prompted such a generous action. After an active life of more than fifty-five years, spent in business affairs involving residence on one side or the other of the Great Lakes—I believe we are to devote this afternoon to the Great Lakes—it would be strange indeed if I were not moved by such a mark of friendship, especially when my memory goes back for thirty years to the time when Mr. Butler and I were fellow townsmen, and his honored father was one of the great figures which impressed my Canadian mind with the character and the intellectual vigor of the leading lawyers of your country. You will therefore understand how deeply touched I am that he should be today the President of the body which seeks to do me such a great honor.

Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is to speak to you about the Rush-Bagot Agreement and it occurred to me that I could not do better than to say a few words as to what the Great Lakes have meant to all of us. I am a little timid about saying very much, after the splendid ideas which have flown from the Mayor and when we are all conscious that this country is facing a moment of vast importance. I will, however, ask you to forget the great war in Europe for a short time and to give your attention to matters connected with the centennial which we are now celebrating.

It would be more than strange if a long life divided between the two countries and spent largely in international business had not impressed me with a profound conviction of the value of the Great Lakes not merely in our separate national development, but in our international relations. I am amused that reference has been made to my being a Fellow of the Geological Society of England, but I hope you will not be alarmed by what I am about to say. It does seem desirable that we should understand the Great Lakes. The vast Laurentian upland of North America, its flanks covered by hundreds of feet of palaeozoic strata from the earliest sediments to the close of the Devonian system, already eroded and altered during a vast range of time, presented to the seas formed by the retiring ice sheet and the glaciers connected therewith, a series of difficulties. Thus, while the course of what eventually became the Great Lakes followed as usual the general line of the lower lands and the weaker strata, it was so influenced by barriers of drift, by crustal warpings, by the great Niagara

escarpment which divides the area and by other obstructions, that the resulting conditions are profoundly different from those of the pre-glacial era, and whether these geological facts interest us or not, it is due to them that we have thus become the inheritors not only of the enormous glaciated area on which our agriculture is based, but of half the fresh water of the globe.

However dramatic may have been the efforts of Mother Earth in adjusting her shrinking robe in the distant past, we are apt to think she has now finally settled the matter, but unfortunately, as geologists know, she is never still, and if the present tilting of the land in a southwesterly direction at the rate of about six inches in a century goes on, Chicago will be submerged and eventually the waters of our precious possessions, the Great Lakes, will reach the ocean via the Mississippi. But the earth may change its mind before that happens and decide upon a tilt in the other direction.

What our inland seas meant to Champlain when, after making his toilsome way up the rapids of the St. Lawrence he first saw Lake Ontario; or what they meant to La Salle when he found that he must build another ship at the head of the Niagara escarpment in order to navigate the second great sea, Lake Erie, or what they meant to later Frenchmen who thought that Lake Superior was surely the Pacific and the long-sought road to China, we can but faintly imagine.

It is conceivable that but for the little misunderstanding which caused the greatest republic the world has ever known to be created, these wonderful expanses of fresh water might have been within the boundaries of one great state, but after the American revolution they became instead the dividing line between two vast territories, and the settlers scattered here and there along their borders felt that only the water between kept them from flying at each others' throats. The petty quarrel at Sackett's Harbor, the shooting of an Indian on the Detroit River are small events in themselves, but for matters as trifling as these nations have warred with each other from time immemorial. The irritable condition along the border following the war of 1812 caused Mr. Adams to propose that peace on these lakes should be secured by the simple process of not allowing instruments of warfare to exist upon the lakes, but he can hardly have dreamed how important would be the consequences of the agreement resulting from his proposal. Who could have foretold that the wild St. Mary's Falls beside the fur-trader's depot and the Indian camps at Point Iroquois, would be replaced by canals through which there passes a tonnage so enormous that they constitute one of the greatest channels of commerce in the world? Forty years after the consummation of the Rush-Bagot Agreement the

total freight passing through the canals in a year was only about fifty thousand tons; fifty years later it was over fifty million tons; last year it was eighty million tons. Who could have foretold that on these lakes would be devised the most wonderful schemes known to the world for loading and unloading freight because of the large quantities of grain, of ore and of coal, which have to be rapidly handled, and that the sailing vessels of early days would be replaced by freighters over 600 feet long, capable of carrying half a million bushels of grain or 12,000 to 15,000 tons of ore or coal? Who could have realized that upon the iron mines near the shores of the great lakes and on cheap lake freights the steel mills would so largely depend? Who could have foretold that the wheat markets of Europe would annually wait with breathless interest for the opening of navigation at the head of Lake Superior so that the grain fleets might set forth? Who would have guessed that cities on the prairies of Western Canada would be kept warm in winter by coal mined in Pennsylvania? Who indeed can number the countless ventures of man which are dependent for their success on the existence of the Great Lakes?

The Rush-Bagot Agreement transformed these lakes from a dividing line between two embittered peoples into the greatest agency of peace and industry in the whole world and doubtless it was the discovery that it was possible for us on the Great Lakes to live without fighting that made possible that most curious of all international boundaries, the 49th parallel.

We have lived in peace for one hundred years, and, thank God, we can now safely celebrate that first centennial of peace between two peoples which we were so rudely prevented from celebrating in 1914 by the outbreak of war in Europe. Two states each with territory of about the same size, but one having at least twelve times as many people as the other, both high-spirited and with that quickness to resent injury which is characteristic between blood relations, have settled all their quarrels for a century without recourse to arms. The questions of boundaries and the other matters incident to their early relations are now disposed of and, despite the present events in Europe—perhaps, indeed, the more because of them—we feel confident that we at least among the nations of this weary and troubled earth have for all time found the path of peace.

While the conditions which make for peace and prevent war were secured so early in our history, many other things have helped to bind us together, so completely that even our differences are respected and the fact that two great democracies are trying social experiments, sometimes along widely separated lines, is more apt to excite mutual respect and interest than animosity.

We speak mainly the same language, we read the same books, we recognize the same King Alfred as the fountain head of our liberties, the same Saxon freemen, the same Magna Charta, the same Shakespeare, the same Cromwell.

How much I dare say regarding the great war I do not know, but this I am very anxious to say. We Canadians who have sent our sons, who have suffered and spent so much, do not wish to be told that we are fighting merely for the sake of the dear Motherland. We are of course fighting for her, doubtless most of us would fight for her whether her cause was right or wrong, but we know, every man in the Canadian army who is Canadian by birth knows, that he is fighting for the right to live, the right to continue to enjoy that blessed liberty which every individual seeks to enjoy. We have had you as neighbors for one hundred years, but let me say that if we lose, if we are beaten on the battlefields of Europe, we in Canada do not believe that there is any power in the world that can save us from what would happen. We do not believe that even the greatest republic the world has ever known, and the sincere friend of Canada, could save Canada from the effects that would follow defeat; and if you will let me say so, we do not believe that anything could save the great republic from what would happen.

Therefore, permit me to say, as my concluding words, that we should let our prayer be that the rulers of this country set their faces in a determination to secure peace, a peace that will last for all time; but that in trying to secure that peace, they will see that it is a peace based upon principles of justice and right, regardless of what they have to pass through before they secure it.

A. H. SPENCER, Esq.:

Ladies and Gentlemen, Brothers in Law and—As One Of My Precursors on this Platform Remarked—Sisters in Law:

This occasion, as Mr. Butler has already told you, has broadened out considerably from what it had originally been intended or expected to be. Circumstances have shaped themselves so as to make it almost an international gathering. The flags that you see around you are an illustration of that. We have endeavored to express our sentiment towards the British-Canadian flag by surrounding it with two American flags. The little green flag in the corner which so modestly hides itself away and which you all perhaps may not be able to see, has a special significance

to-day, and possibly may be found suggestive to the Club in kindly contemplation of our brothers of Erin, their reluctance to hold office, to be employed in civic life, or otherwise to come into public notice.

Something has been said about the Rush-Bagot Agreement. I suppose all but a very few of you here remember it perfectly, but for the benefit of those who have forgotten it or overlooked it in their haste, this being just a family party and not a public meeting, I am going to read it to you.

An exchange of notes had occurred between the respective representatives of Great Britain and America, Mr. Bagot and Mr. Rush, with regard to the problem of arming or not arming the frontiers between America and Canada. This agreement has never been referred to as a treaty, but at least it has the merit of not having been regarded as a "scrap of paper." The announcement of this agreement was made by President James Monroe in a proclamation by the President of the United States. It is very short and I will read it.

> "Whereas, an arrangement was entered into at the City of Washington, in the month of April in the year of our Lord one thousand, eight hundred and seventeen, between Richard Rush, Esquire, at that time Acting Secretary for the Department of State of the United States, for and in behalf of the Government of the United States, and the Right Honorable Charles Bagot, His Britannic Majesty's Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, for and in behalf of his Britannic Majesty, which arrangement is in words following, to wit:
>
> " 'The naval forces to be maintained upon the American lakes by His Majesty and the Government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side; that is, on Lake Ontario, to one vessel not exceeding one hundred tons burden and armed with one eighteen pound cannon.'—That was before the days of high explosives.
>
> " 'On the Upper Lakes'—here is where we got recklessly belligerent—'to two vessels not exceeding like burden each and armed with like force.
>
> " 'On the waters of Lake Champlain, to one vessel not exceeding like burden and armed with like force.
>
> " 'All other vessels on these lakes shall be forthwith dismantled and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.

" 'If either party should be hereafter desirous of annulling this stipulation, and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

" 'The naval force so to be limited shall be restricted to such service as will, in no respect, interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

" 'And, whereas, the Senate of the United States have approved of the said arrangement, and recommended that it should be carried into effect, the same having also received the sanction of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent acting in the name and on behalf of His Britannic Majesty,

" 'Now, therefore, I, James Monroe, President of the United States, do, by this proclamation, make known and declare that the arrangement aforesaid, and every stipulation thereof, has been duly entered into, concluded and confirmed, and is of full force and effect.

" 'Given under my hand at the City of Washington, this 28th day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighteen'—the arrangement was concluded in 1817—'and of the independence of the United States, the forty-second.

" 'By the President,

" 'JAMES MONROE.' "

That is all of it, gentlemen; a short but effective exhibit of American efficiency.

Now I have referred to the little green flag. I can not help thinking that it reminds me of three amiable, admirable and well known Irishmen, St. Patrick, Fitzpatrick and Ormsby McHarg.

Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was, or at first thought he was, unable to come to this meeting, but he allowed himself to be persuaded. He slept a while over it and, as a result of his dreams, he is here. He has written me occasional letters during this period while we have so to speak, been exchanging protocols. Having ascertained from the Canadian "Who's Who," something about Sir Charles, and here again the suggestion of a society of statistical engineers comes into mind, I will not read all on these pages, but merely note a few as I go along:

Sir Charles says that he has filled many public positions in connection with the administration of the law, by accident.

The first thing is: Born, Quebec, December 19, 1853. I don't know whether he includes that in the catalogue of accidents

or not. But I observe he carries many titles—K. C., G. C. M. G., B. C. L.—that is all I see here. And, going on down the list, I find that he is, among other things, Batonnier General, Quebec, 1898-1900. I don't know whether you know what that is, anyway I don't, but the facts I will specially emphasize are these, that Sir Charles represented the Dominion Government before the Privy Council in England in the Fisheries Case in 1897; was ex-officio member of the Royal Commission for the Revision of Public Statutes, 1902; British Member of the Peace Tribunal at the Hague in 1908, etc; Minister of Justice, 1902-1906, and received his present appointment as Chief Justice of Canada June 4, 1906; Deputy Governor General, one of the English representatives under the treaty of September 14, 1914; Member of His Majesty's Privy Council, 1908; K. C. M. G., 1907; G. C. M. G., and invested by the King in person, 1911.

In addition to these titles, together with Sir Edmund Walker he is a member of The Lawyers Club, and I have great honor in introducing Sir Charles Fitzpatrick.

ADDRESS OF
SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK

MR. PRESIDENT, MR. SPENCER, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your very generous references to myself. I do not, of course, pretend to deserve them, but I appreciate the spirit which moved you to speak of me as you have done.

I am also under obligations to you, Gentlemen, for your warm reception; that, I am vain enough to imagine, I do to some extent deserve. I do not, it is true, belong to that ever-increasing class of Canadians who on the approach of Easter dream of the Elysian fields as situate somewhere between Broadway and Fifth Avenue; but I love your streets, avenues, boulevards and parks. Your libraries, museums and picture galleries are a never-failing source of amusement and instruction. Your very crowds appeal to me. I enjoy a visit between twelve and one to lower Fifth Avenue to see the new-born American who asserts his rights to citizenship in Yiddish and jostles the ordinary wayfarer off the side-walk. By way of contrast, I wonder at those great crowds of men and women, who throng your churches to ask Christ crucified for light, and guidance, and strength to bear their daily burdens.

Speaking of your museums reminds me of an incident that happened some years ago when I was visiting the Aquarium at Naples. I had gone through the Exhibits, and when about to take my leave of the affable guardian, I said: "This, I presume, is the finest aquarium in the world?"—"You are probably an American?" said he.—"Well," I replied in my best Latin, "Distinguo," let me distinguish, "I come from a country which contains within its boundaries, geographically, more than half of the North American Continent, but unfortunately I have no connection with the smaller country to the South." But, I added: "Why do you ask?"—"Well," he said, "this is the best aquarium in the world, except the one in New York." Now I cannot tell you whether that observation was prompted by a Washingtonian love of truth, or with a view to the expected tip, but if the latter, I admit that my guide's flattery went home and he benefitted accordingly.

I confess that I felt much honored by the invitation to appear before you on this occasion, but, as Mr. Spencer has just told you, it was not without misgiving that I accepted it. I felt then, and now that I have attempted the task, I feel to a much larger degree, the truth of the saying of the writer in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, "that the wisdom of the scribe cometh of the opportunity of leisure." It is one of the many drawbacks of a

fairly busy professional and political life that, however great one's interest may be in subjects concerning the history of one's own country, even if allied to the work of one's profession, and however strong one's views, the time necessary to manifest usefully the one, or to give practical effect to the other, is almost invariably wanting.

The subject assigned to me is full of interest, and it is fitting that, at a time when the whole British Empire is staking its life for the sake of a treaty we should assemble here to-day to commemorate an agreement which has not been broken, but has been faithfully kept for a hundred years. When John Quincy Adams in November 1815, on behalf of the Government at Washington, first approached Lord Castlereagh with a proposal for mutual disarmament on the Great Lakes, he was happy in his opportunity. The message, which, as the United States Minister in London, Adams had to deliver to the British Government, was drafted by James Monroe, then Secretary of State. The Great War which had devastated the world for more than twenty years was over, Waterloo had been fought and won, and Napoleon, not satisfied with Elba, had gone to St. Helena. The peoples of Europe were blindly feeling their way, and groping out towards some happier system, which would rid the world of war forever. Already statesmen were building cloud-castles in the air, and dreaming of the reign of universal peace, entirely oblivious of the fact that, as Joseph de Maistre said, "depuis le jour où Caïn tua Abel il y a toujours eu ça et là sur la surface du globe des mares de sang, que n'ont pu dessécher, ni les vents avec leurs brûlantes haleines, ni le soleil avec tous ses feux." Visionary schemes were the subject of eager discussion, and found a ready welcome, and some of the best minds of Europe were being dazzled by the dream which afterwards took form as the Holy Alliance—that strange system by which the banded Kings were pledged to regard each other as brothers, and their peoples as their children and to ensue the Gospel of Christ. That Alliance has been well described as a "piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense." The Great Powers who were parties to it did not realize that we live "in a world of flux and change," and that with peoples as with individuals, "growth and development are among the conditions of life." The political situation in Europe proves the futility of "an attempt to fit growing organisms into iron cases."

Then suddenly came the short practical message from across the Atlantic. It offered no revolutions in the world's affairs, and held out no special promise of permanency; but its work endures today while the Holy Alliance is dead and its very purpose forgotten. The reason of the difference is not far to seek. To some, treaties and conventions are mere talk with which senti-

mental philanthropists amuse themselves, scraps of paper, to be consigned to the waste basket when they stand in the way of the ambitious designs of Emperors and Kings; whilst to others agreements mean the plighted word and have their sanction in the Divine precept which enjoins that man must, in public as in private life, "keep sacred his covenant."

Monroe's letter was a model of brevity, clearness and simplicity, and ran as follows :

> "The information you give of orders having been issued by the British Government to increase its naval force on the Lakes is confirmed by intelligence from that quarter of measures having been actually adopted for the purpose. It is evident if each party augments its force there with a view to obtain the ascendency over the other, that vast expense will be incurred and the danger of collision will be augmented in like degree. The President is sincerely desirous to prevent an evil which, it is presumed, is equally to be deprecated by both Governments. He therefore authorizes you to propose to the British Government such an arrangement respecting the naval force to be kept on the Lakes by both Governments, as will demonstrate their pacific policy and secure their peace. He is willing to confine it on each side to a certain moderate number of armed vessels, and the smaller the number the more agreeable to him; or to abstain altogether from an armed force beyond that used for the revenue. You will bring this subject under the consideration of the British Government immediately after the receipt of this letter."

Lord Castlereagh was surprised and perplexed, and naturally inclined at first to be a little suspicious. Such an engagement would tie the hands of both parties until war should have commenced, and the Americans by their proximity would be able to prepare armaments for attack much sooner than those of the British could be prepared for defense. On January 31, 1816, Adams, writing to Monroe, says: "I think the proposal will not be accepted." But the proposal was renewed in a note of which the following extract is far-sighted:

> "The increase of naval armaments on one side upon the lakes during peace, will necessitate the like increase on the other, and besides causing an aggravation of useless expense to both parties, must operate as a continual stimulus of suspicion and of ill-will upon the inhabitants and local authorities of the borders against those of their neighbors. The moral and political tendency of such a system must be to war and not to peace."

Words pregnant with wisdom and political foresight.

One would imagine that when he wrote that letter Mr. Monroe had present to his mind this phrase from Bacon (Essay, of Empire): "Let men beware how they neglect and suffer matter of trouble to be prepared; for no man can forbid the spark nor tell whence it may come."

Certainly if Castlereagh had been inclined to take a narrow view of the situation there was abundant ground for hesitation. At that very time Great Britain was making a determined effort to secure a superiority of naval force on the Lakes. At Kingston a ship-of-the-line built to carry 110 guns and two vessels that were able to mount 74 guns, were being hurried to completion. Moreover insistent demands were being made in both Houses of Parliament for a more vigorous policy, and the building of a formidable fleet for Canadian waters. Still the folly and waste of such a competition were apparent, and in April Adams was able to report Castlereagh as admitting that, "to keep a number of armed vessels parading about upon the Lakes in times of peace would be ridiculous and absurd. There could be no motive for it, and everything beyond what should be necessary to guard against smuggling, would be calculated only to produce mischief."

But he then pointed out that though disarmament was so desirable in itself, the disadvantages attending it would be felt only by Great Britain. If war broke out suddenly, and found both countries without a naval force on the Lakes, clearly the United States would be in a much better position than Great Britain to extemporize a fleet. In those days of wooden vessels, the building materials were ready at hand in the forests along the shores of the Lakes, and Great Britain from the geographical position would be hopelessly handicapped. For her, if she looked for war, the policy of a perpetual preparedness was absolutely essential. Happily Lord Castelreagh took the larger view. He was keenly alive to the waste of competitive armaments, and admitted all Mr. Adams had to urge in regard to the constant occasion of provocation which must arise on both sides out of the presence of armed vessels in the same inland waters. What a danger to international peace this proximity of naval fleets in confined waters must have proved will be apparent if we consider for a moment the case of the Great Ocean fleets of the world. You will remember how in the days before the war the naval estimates and programmes of the great Powers were always the object of jealous scrutiny in every country. No exception was made even in the case of Great Britain, for whom a supreme fleet is simply a life belt; without it she sinks at once, and starves before she goes under. Her fleet, as a neces-

sity of self-defense, is neither a threat nor a challenge to any, and her ships cruise impartially from Archangel to Hongkong, and are equally at home in the Atlantic and the Pacific, in the Red Sea, the White Sea, the Yellow Sea or at the gates of the Black Sea. But a British war vessel on the Great Lakes could have only one possible opponent, and the presence of an American ship in the same waters necessarily suggested comparisons, and inevitable speculations as to the result of a trial of strength with her rival. In these circumstances, what opportunities there would be for rumors, and exaggerations, and the suspicions born of both, whenever there was any special activity in the shipyards at either end of the Lakes, bathing the frontiers of both countries! And here, remember, that at the beginning of the last century each lake was a separate entity. To-day, there is an uninterrupted waterway from Fort William to the Strait of Belisle. Then Lake Superior was cut off from all communication with Huron, and the canals on either side of the Rapids of the Sault St. Marie, which, in the year before the war, carried a *traffic three times as great* as that of the Great Waterway at Suez, had not even been thought of. In the same way, Lake Ontario was cut off by the Rapids of the St. Lawrence and the Falls of Niagara, while the Falls of the Ste. Claire River effectively closed Lake Erie; so that any ship built on the border of one of these lakes had to be maintained there, and spend the rest of its existence on that particular lake. Its sole function and purpose was to counteract the influence of some rival vessel on the other side of the lake. Lord Castelreagh could not forecast the future, but he was a good judge of the present, and had schooled himself to the thought that to prevent war was better than preparation for it.

Mr. Adams wrote to the impatient Monroe on March 30, 1816:

> "You may consider it certain that the proposal to disarm on the Lakes will not be accepted."

But a fortnight later the principle of the proposals had been accepted. Before this conclusion, however, was arrived at, Lord Castlereagh took the opportunity to remind Mr. Adams, that there would have been no need for the present apprehensions if only the recommendations of the British Commissioners at Ghent had been adopted. Mr. Adams reported as follows: "He then pointed out that Great Britain had proposed, at the negotiations at Ghent, that the whole of the Lakes, including the shores, should belong to one party. In that case there would have been a large and wide natural separation between the two territories, and there would have been no necessity for armaments." Surely here was insight and vision! If all the Great Lakes, and their

coasts, to a suitable depth, including the sites now occupied by Chicago and Milwaukee, Detroit and Buffalo, had been assigned to Canada, there would have been no question of rival naval forces, and I would be deprived of the pleasure of being your guest to-day. But if Lord Castlereagh sighed like a statesman over the vanished scheme, he proposed like a practical man to deal with the facts as he found them. On August 13th, 1816, the new British Minister at Washington, Mr. Charles Bagot, was able to give the assurance that "all further augmentation of the British naval force now in commission on the Lakes will be immediately suspended." In August, matters were carried a step further when Bagot gave Monroe full particulars of the existing British fleet. Considering that, in those days, it often took months to get a reply between London and Washington, it cannot be said that the negotiations had been unduly protracted. But they were not quick enough to please Mr. Monroe. And here let me remark that in the past, in her dealings with England, the United States has generally had this advantage, that her troubles have come to her singly and not in batallions. On the other hand, the harassed statesman who represented Great Britain has often had urgent claims on his attention from many parts of the world and so been tempted to let one care drive out another. In that way delays and silences have often followed, which have given occasion for suspicions of rudeness or indifference. In November, 1816, Mr. Monroe in a letter to Adams notes Lord Castlereagh's silence and then goes on to use words which show that he was beginning to distrust the good faith of the British representative:

> "The limited powers that were given to Mr. Bagot had much appearance that the object was to amuse us rather than to adopt any effectual measure. The supply in the interim of Canada with a vast amount of cannon and munitions is a circumstance which has not escaped attention."

But there was no ground for these misgivings, and an exchange of notes ratifying an agreement on the lines originally suggested by Mr. Monroe, took place on the 28th and 29th of April, 1817. This document bore the signature of Charles Bagot, British Minister at Washington and Richard Rush who was Secretary of State.

Of the two men whose names thus acquired an immortality of fame, Mr. Bagot played the slighter part owing to the very limited nature of the powers entrusted to him. One hopes he enjoyed his stay at Washington, but as the first representative of Great Britain after a war which had left such bitter memories as those of the fratricidal struggle in 1812-14, his position was a difficult one. That he did not expect to find a bed of roses at

Washington may perhaps be inferred, from the following passage in a letter addressed to him, just after his appointment, by Canning:

> "I am afraid the question is not so much how you will treat them (the Americans) as how they will treat you, and that the hardest lesson which a British Minister has to learn in America is not what to do but what to bear. But even this may come round. And Waterloo is a great help to you, perhaps a necessary help after the (to say the least) balanced successes and misfortunes of the American war."

How curious all this reads when one thinks of the leave-taking of Mr. Bryce! However Bagot went out with instructions to do whatever was possible to promote the restoration of cordial good feeling between the two countries. Of Richard Rush, who was Secretary of State when the Agreement was signed, and American Minister in London for the greater part of the year which elapsed before the arrangement was finally approved of by the Senate and proclaimed by the President, we get pleasant glimpses in the pages of that very entertaining book, "Memoranda of a Residence at the Court of London." In its opening chapter he thus describes the dispositions in which, in his opinion, an American Minister to London ought to approach his task:

> "No language can express the emotion which almost every American feels, when he first touches the shores of Europe. This feeling must have a special increase, if it be the case of a citizen of the United States, going to England. Her fame is constantly before him; he hears of her statesmen, her orators, her scholars, her philosophers, her divines, her patriots. In the nursery he learns her ballads. Her poets train his imagination. Her language is his, with its whole intellectual riches, past and forever newly flowing; a tie, to use Burke's figure, 'light as air, and unseen, but stronger than links of iron.' In spite of political differences, her glory allures him; in spite of hostile collision he clings to her lineage. 'Three thousand miles,' said Franklin, 'are as three thousand years; intervention of space seems to kindle enthusiasm, like intervention of time.' Is it not fit that two such nations should be friends? Let us hope. It is the hope which every minister from the United States should carry with him to England; it is the hope in which every British Minister of State should meet him. If, nevertheless, rivalry is in the nature of things, at least let it be on fair principles, let it be generous, never paltry, never malignant."

Mr. Rush was a man of wide culture and gifted with an historic imagination. When the vessel that was taking him to England was off the Isle of Wight, he tells how he reflected that

perhaps they were passing in the very track of the Armada, and how his comrades talked of the "hero Queen of Tilbury." When the Portsmouth bells were set ringing in his honor on the evening of his arrival he says:

> "It passed in our thoughts that the same bells might have rung their peals for the victories of Hawke and Nelson. 'Perhaps,' said one of the party, 'for Sir Cloudsley Shovel too.' "

His reception in London was from the first all that he hoped for, and he was soon the object of hospitalities, of which, at a later period, he wrote:

> "They can neither pass from the memory nor grow cold upon the heart."

But though Mr. Rush never spared himself in his efforts to bring about a better understanding between the two countries, he proved himself a sturdy patriot, and succeeded in wresting from Great Britain concessions in regard to the cod fisheries, which afterwards caused great resentment in the Maritime Provinces of Canada. Possibly, however, if the attempts to settle the dispute about the Oregon boundary, which were made while Rush was in London, had been successful, the frontier line between our two countries might have been placed further south. He notes the inquisitive habits of the British, which had led them into the remotest corners of the earth, and with the composure of an historian, and the detachment of a philosopher muses over the persistency of the racial type. After recalling that in the days of Queen Mary, British traders had carried their wares all the long road from Archangel to Bagdad, he goes on to say:

> "It makes a parallel passage in their history to see them at the present day pressing forward to supply with rifles and blankets savage hordes who roam through the woods and paddle their canoes over the waters of the farthest and wildest portions of the American continent—on shores which the waters of the Northern Pacific wash in solitude."

But it was a British statesman who would have given away the whole of British Columbia on the ground that, a country where the salmon would not rise to a fly could not be worth keeping.

The agreement which bears the name of Rush and Bagot was at least a model of brevity and simplicity. Both sides knew what they wanted, and they wanted the same thing. It was agreed that:

The naval force to be "maintained" by each Government on the Great Lakes should be limited; on Lake Ontario, to one ves-

sel not exceeding 100 ton burden and armed with one 18-pound cannon; on the Upper Lakes, to two vessels of the same burden and armament; and on Lake Champlain, to one similar vessel. All other armed vessels on the Lakes were to be forthwith dismantled, and "no other vessels of war" were to be "there built and armed." This stipulation was to remain in effect till six months after either party should have given notice to the other of a desire to terminate it.

The British authorities at once dismantled, or broke up, three ships-of-the-line, six medium size vessels and a number of smaller craft, while the blessed work of destruction was carried on in the American harbors on a still more extensive scale.

It was only some months later that a doubt arose as to the validity of the Agreement, as to whether it so far partook of the nature of a foreign treaty as to require the assent of the United States Senate. It was thought better to avoid all possible complications on this score by bringing the matter formally before the Senate. This was done in due course and, on April 16, 1818, the Senate "approved and consented," and a few days later, the terms of the agreement were formally proclaimed by President Monroe.

To this day, however, the "Rush-Bagot Agreement" has never been regarded or spoken of as a formal international treaty. It was an Agreement by an exchange of notes to which each side gave effect. The arrangement worked well and smoothly from the first, and its conditions have been faithfully kept, in the spirit, if not always in the letter, by both sides. During the years 1838-41 the rebellion in Canada led the British Government to increase somewhat its naval force on the Lakes. American remonstrances were met by the explanation to the effect, that the measures taken were purely defensive and temporary, and that the normal state of things would be restored at the earliest possible moment. In 1857 the British Government complained of the presence of the "Michigan" on the Upper Lakes as that of an armed vessel of much greater tonnage than the agreement allowed. That, on this occasion, the British Foreign Office was not overhasty to take offense, may perhaps be inferred from the fact that the "Michigan" had been on the Upper Lakes for thirteen years before this objection was raised. In reply the United States Government at once admitted that the "Michigan" was many times too big, but urged in extenuation that it was armed only with the sort of toy gun which the Agreement sanctioned. I understand this vessel is still afloat, an historic relic—as the "Wolverine."

Nine years later, graver issues were involved. Parties of Confederates, using Canada as their base, had captured Federal steamers on Lake Erie, and had raided a town in Vermont. Mr.

Seward, the American Secretary of State, gave notice that "owing to recent hostile and piratical proceedings on the lakes" it would be necessary to increase "the observing force" maintained there. At the same time, following the precedent set at the time of the Canadian rebellion, he explained that the steps taken were merely defensive, and would be discontinued as soon as the danger they were designed to meet had passed away. Mr. Seward further and rightly insisted that "neither party meant to relinquish the right of self-defense in the event of civil war." At the same time, to make the position of his Government absolutely correct, and to secure a free hand in the future, he gave the requisite six months' notice to terminate the Agreement. This was accepted by Great Britain with the expression of a hope that the old arrangement might be restored after peace. This action of Secretary Seward was formally approved at a joint session of the Congress in February, 1865. But at that time the triumph of the Northern Armies was in sight, and, before the six months had elapsed, the notice to terminate the Agreement was withdrawn. The United States Government informed His Majesty's Government that they were willing that the Agreement should remain "practically" in force, which has been construed to mean that the arrangement must be regarded as still in existence.

It would be hard to overrate the blessings that that Agreement has been to both countries. It has been the keynote of their policy of peace for a hundred years, and at the same time has happily influenced the attitude of both Governments towards the whole question of fortifications. And what an object lesson has been here for the rest of the civilized world. The longest frontier on the earth's surface has at the same time been the most defenseless—and the most safe. If there had been the slightest disposition to bad faith on either side, the Rush-Bagot Agreement would have broken down a score of times. It made no distinction between vessels of war and ships armed for the revenue service, which remained outside its restrictions; and yet neither side has ever thought of taking advantage of that loop-hole of evasion. The Agreement just because it was founded in good will has outlived all the conditions of its birth. Sailing vessels have given way to steam, and wood to iron, and Lakes that were then isolated and independent have now free access to the sea, while their shores which were then almost tractless solitudes are now thick with great and crowded cities. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in the Commons at Ottawa, six years ago, used these memorable words:

> "If my voice could be heard that far, I would presume to say to our American friends; 'there may be a spectacle, perhaps, nobler than that of a United Continent—a spectacle that would astound the world by its novelty and grandeur—

the spectacle of two peoples living in amity side by side for a distance of four thousand miles along a line which is hardly visible in many quarters, with no cannon, no guns frowning across it, with no fortresses on either side, with no armament one against another, but living in harmony and mutual confidence, and with no other rivalry than generous emulation in the arts of peace.' To the Canadian people I would say that if it is possible for us to maintain such relations between these two growing nations, Canada will have rendered to Old England a service unequalled in its present effect and still more in its far-reaching consequences."

Surely to-day we may say that splendid dream is far on the way to realization. From the Atlantic to the Pacific the Canadian frontier line stretches for three thousand eight hundred and forty miles and its strength lies not in armaments, Holy Alliances or Leagues of Peace, but in Canada's trust in God and in the honor and good faith of its great neighbor. A cynic might say that this long line remains without fortifications on either side because much of it is geographically incapable of effective military defense. But that would be a very superficial contention. When the Old World peoples plan a readjustment of international boundaries the first thing done is to seek out what is called a strategical frontier.. In the New World the simplicity of a unit of latitude has sufficed. From the Lake-of-the-Woods to the Pacific the forty-ninth parallel is good enough for us, and I doubt not, if circumstances had permitted, the Equator itself would have been pressed into service and made to serve as an American frontier line; and why this difference between the Old World and the New? The only answer is that strategic frontiers are unnecessary where good faith and mutual trust prevail.

At the same time and at this moment, I cannot but remember that there is another people that put its whole trust in a treaty, and that that trust was betrayed, when Germany struck her foul blow and violated the frontier of Belgium. And yet, on the other hand, note—and it is very relevant to this discussion—that Great Britain was the first of the neutral powers to enter the war, and that she did so for the sake of that same treaty. If England, and the four Dominions of Canada—Australia, South Africa and New Zealand—are at war today, and have staked their lives on the issue, it is primarily because they are minded to be faithful to Belgium and true to the treaty which Great Britain has signed.

A friend who heard of my coming here observed cynically: "So many vessels have been driven through that century old agreement that it is now but a thing of shreds and patches. Over 8,000 tons of shipping (war vessels) and near 2,000 naval

volunters can now be found under the American flag on the Great Lakes." I suspect that many of the Summer manoeuvres are organized to enable handsome young Americans to visit the Lake watering places and display their natty uniforms for the benefit of their lady friends. As I have already said, we live in a world of flux and change and if occasion requires it, why should the agreement not be modified to fit the new order of things, with such adaptation to the exigencies of the future as prudence may forecast.

Time and occasion will not permit of any but the briefest discussion of the inadequacy of the agreement to meet the exigencies of the changed conditions of modern days. I suppose the prohibition of construction of vessels of war is the principal source of trouble, due to the very natural desire of the shipbuilding establishments, which have grown up on the Lake shores, to share in the construction of the United States Navy.

Is it possible to satisfy this wish without incurring the same dangers as were foreseen, and intended to be guarded against by the treaty made in 1817? The situation in the two countries is not alike, for, apart from any question of greater facilities for building modern warships which may be possessed by the United States, the Imperial Navy is not constructed on this continent as the U. S. Navy is. The construction of warships without limitation would largely deprive the treaty of any value. It is, however, difficult to imagine any restrictions which will not be open to the same objection on the part of those who may be prevented by them from obtaining a valuable contract. This it must be remembered will apply to ships to be built for foreign governments as well as for the United States.

The difficulties to be met will be great and I cannot attempt to offer any satisfactory solution of them. I gladly, however, welcome the opportunity of suggesting them for the consideration of this assembly of so much of the most eminent legal authority in your country. If my remarks should be the means of turning your attention to the subject and your wisdom devise provision to attain an object of such importance to the welfare of each of our countries I shall feel that I have not idly occupied your time and for myself obtained a great reward.

A. H. SPENCER, Esq.:

The Mayor has asked me, ladies and gentlemen, to express his regrets at being obliged to leave, and to explain to you that the duties of his office, with the speech-making to-day and the St. Patrick's parades, and so forth, have prevented him from remaining as long as he should have liked.

Now, ladies and gentlemen—or, as I would prefer to call you at this time, men and women—I know that it is not the function of a toastmaster to be a speechmaker, and I am not going to undertake that activity. Let me remind you merely of this, that times are coming—and perhaps they are here now—when the greatest of all the sacraments shall present itself for our acceptance—that of self-sacrifice. As a test of our willingness to conform to that virtue today I must announce that we had expected to be addressed by General Wood and all the arrangements had been completed for his presence with us. We have received his telephone message that he is unexpectedly and hurriedly called to Philadelphia, for reasons I know not, but that no doubt pertain to Government duty.

It is usually unwise and always dangerous to prophecy or to predict. May we not at least venture to say that we are entering upon times when pussyfooting, mollycoddling, weasel wording or watchful waiting can be no longer useful. Upon that scene of action where we shall, unless all signs fail, soon be entering, there are three elements with which we shall have to contend, as they—our allies—are contending: First, open enemies that shall fight us upon land and sea: they will be met by those whose duty it is to make peace with the sword, namely, the Army and the Navy. Secondly, there are the secret plotters and propagandists of sedition, who we hope will be properly handled by the Secret Service and the Police, and, thirdly, the element that, ignorant of Nature's law, the law which commands and compels that constant conflict by which the human race and everything in Nature continues to exist, the cessation of which even for a short time produces in turn stagnation, attenuation and final disintegration. Nature will not stand for a non-fighting people. She either enslaves them or pushes them off the earth to make room for a more virile race, and this law, however harsh it may seem, we have to recognize and reckon with. There must be no sublimated exaltation of what is termed peace, which in the minds of many means but a glorification of ease and comfort, the absence of sacrifice and the selfish conservation of property.

And now, shall we send back this message to Canada? America has been sluggish, the time had not arrived, circumstances had not yet formed themselves into that context of conditions that encouraged us to move, however impatient some of us have been. But we are being aroused, we are awakening and the wave of action is gradually—I might say rapidly—coming over us, and when the splendid hour strikes and war's fierce cry comes ringing 'cross the sea, America, her sons—and aye, her daughters too, whose hearts are no less brave than that their heads are wise—will be found with you standing shoulder to

shoulder, elbows touching, fighting the harder because of the very reluctance with which they have been drawn into the fight.

ROBERT C. MORRIS, Esq.:

I move a vote of thanks to the gentlemen who have so ably addressed us this afternoon.

ORMSBY McHARG, Esq.:

I second the motion.

A. H. SPENCER, Esq.:

The motion is unanimously carried. The meeting stands adjourned.

PRESS OF H. K. BREWER & CO.
58 LIBERTY STREET NEW YORK